

CONFIDENTIAL.]

No. 20 of 1883.]

REPORT

OF

NATIVE PAPERS

FOR THE

Week ending the 12th May 1883.

CONTENTS:

	Page.		Page.
The Bengal Tenancy Bill	... 201	Mr. Ilbert's Bill	... 205
The Out-still System	... ib.	Post of Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal	... 206
The Bengal Tenancy Bill	... ib.	Mr. Ilbert's Bill	... ib.
The High-Court	... ib.	Surendra Nath Banerjee	... 207
Third Class Passengers on the East Indian Railway	202	Mr. Ilbert's Bill	... ib.
The Out-still System	... ib.	Mr. Rivers Thompson	... ib.
A New Paper	... ib.	Prem Chand Roychand Studentship	... ib.
Surendra Nath Banerjee	... ib.	Mr. Ilbert's Bill	... ib.
Ditto	... ib.	Surendra Nath Banerjee	... 208
Ditto	... ib.	Ditto	... ib.
Ditto	... ib.	Lord Ripon's Rule	... ib.
Local Self-Government in Dacca	... ib.	Surendra Nath Banerjee	... ib.
Surendra Nath Banerjee	... ib.	Ditto	... ib.
Reduction of Public Expenditure	... ib.	Ditto	... ib.
Surendra Nath Banerjee	... ib.	Study of Persian in the Ravenshaw College	... ib.
Ditto	... ib.	Public events of the last Uriya year	... 209
Ditto	... 204	Mr. Beadon	... ib.

LIST OF NEWSPAPERS.

No.	Names of newspapers,	Place of publication.	Number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
BENGALI.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
1	"Bhárat Shramajíví"	Calcutta	2,100	
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>			
2	"Bhárat Hitaishi"	Burrusal		
3	"Sansodhini"	Chittagong	600	
4	"Purva Pratidhwani"	Ditto		
5	"Játíya Suhrid"	Calcutta		
6	"Tripurá Vártávaha"	Comillah		
7	"Prem Pracháriní"	Nawabgunge, Barrack-pore.		
<i>Weekly.</i>				
8	"Ananda Bazar Patriká"	Comillah	700	7th ditto.
9	"Arya Darpan"	Ditto		4th ditto.
10	"Bangabási"	Ditto		
11	"Bártábaha"	Pubna		
12	"Bhárat Bandhu"	Calcutta		
13	"Bharat Mihir"	Mymensing	671	1st May 1883.
14	"Bengal Advertiser"	Calcutta	2,000	
15	"Bardwán Sanjivání"	Burdwan	296	4th ditto.
16	"Cháruvártá"	Sherepore, Mymensing		7th ditto.
17	"Dacca Prakásh"	Dacca	350	6th ditto.
18	"Dút"	Calcutta		
19	"Education Gazette"	Hooghly	745	11th ditto.
20	"Grámvártá Prakáshiká"	Comercolly		
21	"Halisahar Prakáshiká"	Calcutta		5th ditto.
22	"Hindu Ranjiká"	Beauleah, Rájsháhíe...		5th ditto.
23	"Mediní"	Midnapore	200	9th ditto.
24	"Murshidábád Patriká"	Berhampore		
25	"Murshidábád Pratinidhi"	Ditto	487	
26	"Navavibhákar"	Calcutta		
27	"Paridarshak"	Sylhet	850	7th ditto.
28	"Prajá Bandhu"	Chandernagore		6th ditto.
				8th ditto.

No.	Names of newspapers.	Place of publication.	Number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
BENGALI—concluded.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
29	" Pratikár "	Berhampore	275	
30	" Pratinidhi "	Calcutta	10th May 1883.
31	" Rajshahye Samvád "	Beauleah	
32	" Rungpore Dik Prakásh "	Kakiniá, Rungpore	250	3rd ditto.
33	" Sádháraní "	Chinsurah	500	6th ditto.
34	" Sahachar "	Calcutta	500	2nd ditto.
35	" Samaya "	Ditto	7th ditto.
36	" Sanjivani "	Ditto	
37	" Som Prakásh "	Changripottá, 24-Perghs.	7th ditto.
38	" Sudhákar "	Mymensing	
39	" Sulabha Samáchár "	Calcutta	4,000	5th ditto.
40	" Sríhatta Prakásh "	Sylhet	440	
<i>Daily.</i>				
41	" Samvád Prabhákař "	Calcutta	700	4th to 10th May 1883.
42	" Samvád Púrnachandrodaya "	Ditto	300	7th to 12th ditto.
43	" Samachár Chandriká "	Ditto	625	4th to 9th ditto.
44	" Banga Vidyá Prakáshiká "	Ditto	500	
45	" Prabháti "	Ditto	5th to 12th ditto.
46	" Samáchár Sudhábarsan "	Ditto	
ENGLISH AND URDU.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
47	" Urdu Guide "	Calcutta	365	5th May 1883.
HINDI.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
48	" Bhárat Mitra "	Calcutta	500	3rd ditto.
49	" Sár Sudhánidhi "	Ditto	200	7th ditto.
50	" Uchit Baktá "	Ditto	5th ditto.
PERSIAK.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
51	" Jám-Jahán-numá "	Calcutta	250	4th ditto.
URDU.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
52	" Akhbár-i-Darussaltanat "	Calcutta	
<i>Bi-Weekly.</i>				
53	" Amir-ul-Akhbár "	Calcutta	
ASSAMESE.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
54	" Assam Vilásiní "	Sibsagar	
URIYA.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
55	" Utkal Dípiká "	Cuttack	200	
56	" Utkal Darpan "	Balasore	160	
57	" Balasore Samvad Váhika "	Ditto	125	
58	" Purusottam Patriká "	Pooree	
<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
59	" Mayurbhunj Pákshik Patriká "	Mayurbhunj	
HINDI.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
60	" Kshatriya Patriká "	Patna	

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.

The *Bártabáha*, of the 28th April, considers section 23 of the Bengal Tenancy Bill as very reasonable. Only in The Bengal Tenancy Bill.

BÁRTABAHA,
April 28th, 1883.

be doing anything injurious if the enhanced rent were made payable at once and not gradually. This section should therefore be amended to the effect that its provisions will not apply if the Court decrees as enhanced rent a fourth part of the amount of the former rent. Section 22 should be omitted from the Bill, inasmuch as the provisions of the preceding section, which are very reasonable, bar all arbitrary enhancements. Section 24 is unnecessary, because instances are rare of repeatedly disturbing an assessment within a period of ten years.

2. The *Bhárat Mihir*, of the 1st May, dwells on the evil effects of the introduction of the out-still system into this country, and refers to the petition lately made to Government by certain mill-owners in Bengal on this subject. The Editor agrees with the petitioners in every word they have said.

BHÁRAT MIHIR,
May 1st, 1883.

3. The same paper fully recognizes the importance of the Bengal Tenancy Bill, and in commenting on its provisions it begins with the definition of ryot.

BHÁRAT MIHIR.

The Bengal Tenancy Bill. Now, the Bill is framed mainly in the interests of agricultural tenants, and is not intended to apply to the cases of fishermen, weavers, blacksmiths, petty tradesmen, and others who are concerned with *bastu* land. These are, however, by no means an unimportant section of the community, and it behoves the Legislature to guarantee to them a secure enjoyment of their rights in the *bastu* land from which they are not unoften ejected by unscrupulous landlords. It is therefore desirable that they should be included within the meaning of "settled ryot" as given in the Bill. The definition of "ryot" should therefore be amended.

4. The *Sahachar*, of the 2nd May, contains an article headed "The Disgrace of the High Court." The Editor

SAHACHAR,
May 2nd, 1883.

The High Court.

remarks that Sir Richard Garth is a worthless man, who has brought disgrace upon the seat once filled by Sir Barnes Peacock. The reputation of the High Court for justice, impartiality and courage has, thanks to Sir Richard Garth, considerably diminished. If the helmsman is not good, the rowers also become impudent. Sir L. Jackson, who used to remain like an earthworm in the days of Sir Barnes Peacock, turned under Sir Richard into a venomous snake. If Sir Barnes had been here would the Fields and Prinseps have been able to show so much impudence? Justice Norris would have been taught a lesson within two days. That Sir Richard Garth is not fit for the high post he fills he has shown ever since he came to this country. When the Judges offered insult to the Barristers, Sir Richard took the side of the judges. This time he has brought discredit upon himself by espousing the cause of Mr. Branson, who heaped abuse on Bengali males and females. What business had the Chief Justice to trouble his head with the affairs of Mr. Branson? In truth it was wrong to place such a worthless man on the highest seat in the High Court. That a person who can gratuitously wield his pen against the helpless Bengal ryot in order to advocate the cause of the zemindar, and can sigh in anger, sorrow, and indignation at the news of Justice Mitter's elevation to the Chief Justiceship is not a worthy successor of Sir Barnes Peacock---this is what may be said a hundred times over. It will be a happy day when his term of office expires. It is probable that, at his instigation, the other Judges of the High Court have expressed themselves against Mr. Ilbert's Bill. "A High Court which can express itself against Mr. Ilbert's Bill we hate with all our heart."

BURDWAN SANJIVANI,
May 4th, 1883.

5. The *Burdwan Sanjivani*, of the 4th May, dwells on the inconvenience which persons intending to travel by third class on the East Indian Railway are put to owing to the unsatisfactory booking of third class passengers at the Howrah station of the East Indian Railway.

manner in which they are booked at the Howrah Station. Instead of issuing tickets at one place, they should be issued at least in three different places, and the crowd should be protected from the rude treatment to which they are now subjected at the hands of the constables on duty.

6. The *Grámvártá Prakáshiká*, of the 5th May, supports the memorial made to Government by certain mill-owners in Bengal against the out-still system.

7. We have this week received the first four numbers of a Bengali weekly, published at Calcutta, and entitled the *Sanjivani*. We shall notice their contents

next week.

8. The *Samvád Prabhákar*, of the 9th May, makes remarks regarding the case of Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjee similar to those noticed in paragraph 16.

9. The *Samvád Purnachandrodaya*, of the 7th May, regrets to notice that the majority of the Judges have passed a sentence of imprisonment on Surendra Nath even after he made an apology.

10. The *Prabháti*, of the 7th May, laments the fate of Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjee, but expresses confidence in his ability, and assures him of the sympathy

of the people of India.

11. The same paper, in its issues of the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th May, continues its remarks upon the case of Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjee. The observations

are similar to those noticed in paragraphs 16 and 17.

12. The *Dacca Prakásh*, of the 6th May, refers to the impatience which is being shown by the inhabitants of Dacca at the delay on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor in sending a reply to their petition praying for the introduction of local self-government into Dacca and the establishment of a District Board in connection therewith. His Honor, it is said, is now in his dotage.

13. The *Sádháraní*, of the 6th May, questions the wisdom of the High Court in having punished Surendra Nath Banerjee, even after he had made an

apology. It is not clear how the High Court has by this act maintained its dignity. The Editor promises to resume the subject.

14. The *Uchit Baktá*, of the 5th May, contains an article highly eulogistic of Lord Ripon as Viceroy. His Excellency has undertaken not a few beneficial measures, but one important matter remains to be taken up, namely a reduction of public expenditure.

15. The *Sár Sudhánidhi*, of the 7th May, expresses great sympathy with Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in his present misfortune. His imprisonment has imperilled the safety of native editors. The editor asks to be informed under what law Justice Norris had the *Salgram* brought into the Court. The whole subject should receive the consideration of Lord Ripon.

16. The *Navavibhákar*, of the 7th May, has an article entitled "Surendra, a prisoner to-day," in the course of which the writer says:—It is our impression that, if any person uses words expressive

GRAMVARTA
PRAKASHIKA,
May 5th, 1883.

The out-still system.

SANJIVANI.

A new paper.

SAMBAD
PRAKHAKAR,
May 9th, 1883.

Surendra Nath Banerjee's case.

SAMBAD PUÑA-
CHANDRODAYA,
May 7th, 1883.

Surendra Nath Banerjee's case.

PRABHÁTI,
May 7th, 1883.

Surendra Nath Banerjee's case.

of the people of India.

11. The same paper, in its issues of the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th May, continues its remarks upon the case of Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjee. The observations

DACCA PRAKASH,
May 6th, 1883.

are similar to those noticed in paragraphs 16 and 17.

12. The *Dacca Prakásh*, of the 6th May, refers to the impatience which is being shown by the inhabitants of Dacca at the delay on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor in sending a reply to their petition praying for the introduction of local self-government into Dacca and the establishment of a District Board in connection therewith. His Honor, it is said, is now in his dotage.

ADHARANI,
May 6th, 1883.

13. The *Sádháraní*, of the 6th May, questions the wisdom of the High Court in having punished Surendra Nath Banerjee, even after he had made an

UCHIT BAKTA,
May 5th, 1883.

apology. It is not clear how the High Court has by this act maintained its dignity. The Editor promises to resume the subject.

SAR SUDHÁNIDHI,
May 7th, 1883.

14. The *Uchit Baktá*, of the 5th May, contains an article highly eulogistic of Lord Ripon as Viceroy. His Excellency has undertaken not a few beneficial measures, but one important matter remains to be taken up, namely a reduction of public expenditure.

15. The *Sár Sudhánidhi*, of the 7th May, expresses great sympathy with Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in his present misfortune. His imprisonment has imperilled the safety of native editors. The editor asks to be informed under what law Justice Norris had the *Salgram* brought into the Court. The whole subject should receive the consideration of Lord Ripon.

NAVAVIBHÁKAR,
May 7th, 1883.

16. The *Navavibhákar*, of the 7th May, has an article entitled "Surendra, a prisoner to-day," in the course of which the writer says:—It is our impression that, if any person uses words expressive

of contempt for the High Court, outside of that Court and not in its presence, then under the present law the High Court cannot punish him by means of a summary trial. It is provided in section 480 of the existing Code of Criminal Procedure that, if a person shows contempt for a Court in its presence, that Court shall be able to fine the person guilty of such contempt up to Rs. 200; and if the fine is not paid, it shall be able to award a sentence of simple imprisonment to the extent of one month. Now, this law applies also to the High Court. We find no provision in any law passed by the British Parliament or by the Legislative Council of this country under which the High Court may summarily punish a person who uses words expressive of contempt for it, but not in its presence.

We do not also find any such jurisdiction in the High Court's Letters Patent and Charter. In our opinion, no one can say, after the passing of the present Code of Criminal Procedure, that the powers of the High Court in this respect are unlimited, like those of the Queen's Bench in England. If Surendra Babu had in open Court, and in the presence of Mr. Norris, uttered the words for writing which, in the *Bengali*, he has been imprisoned, or insulted Mr. Norris in any other way, then, under section 480 of the Criminal Procedure Code, Mr. Norris would not have been able to inflict on him any other punishment than a fine of Rs. 200; and yet in the present instance the High Court has imprisoned Surendra Babu for two months, and could have inflicted greater punishment if it had been so willing. The intention of the legislators cannot be so absurd that in a case of contempt of Court, in the presence of the High Court, there should not be a higher punishment than a fine of Rs. 200; whereas in a case of contempt of Court not in its presence, the High Court should be able to inflict any punishment it likes. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that there should exist indefinite powers of punishment in cases where the person punishing is himself prosecutor. Therefore we say that some decision should have been given as to the plea of the High Court's want of jurisdiction raised by Surendra Babu. In our opinion Mr. Bonnerjee did not act well in declining to support that plea. We had expected that the plea having been raised in Surendra's affidavit, the Judges of the High Court would express some sort of opinion regarding it. When a plea of jurisdiction or non-jurisdiction is raised, it ought to be first disposed of. Mr. Bonnerjee did not indeed offer to support this plea; but when he read out to the Court the concluding portion of the affidavit, it cannot be admitted that he waived that plea on behalf of his client. Again, a Court cannot acquire jurisdiction even if the defendant signifies consent. Under these circumstances the Judges ought to have decided this point some way, or other. Instead of doing that the Chief Justice has simply said that the defendant's counsel has acted wisely in refusing to support that plea. We hope that there will be some sort of decision on this point in the Privy Council.

After giving the substance of Surendra Nath's apology, the writer goes on to observe: Considering that no animus against Justice Norris on the part of Surendra Nath was proved to exist, and that there was no reason to disbelieve Surendra Nath's statements made on oath to the effect that he had believed as true the statements contained in *Brahmo Public Opinion*, and in the discharge of his duty as a journalist, and for the good of the public, had made the remarks regarding Justice Norris; and considering, further, that Surendra Nath frankly made an apology to the Court as soon as he was convinced of the falsity of his statements, we had expected that the Judges of the High Court would discharge him. The manner in which Surendra expressed regret and confessed his guilt was conducive to his

own and to the Court's dignity. Unfortunately, the High Court was not of this opinion. The Chief Justice and the majority of his colleagues unanimously passed the severe sentence of imprisonment on him. After the expression of his regret and the confession of his guilt by Surendra Nath would not the dignity of the Court have been maintained if he had been let off with a mild reproof or a mere fine? We believe this course would have enhanced and not impaired the dignity of the Court. The dignity of a Court may indeed be preserved by the infliction of severe punishment or by a threat of punishment, but there are instances in which that dignity can be better consulted by a display of calmness and patience. In this country, in cases similar to the present one, we have not heard of an equally severe punishment being inflicted. Messrs. Piffard and Taylor did neither of them express regret or confess his guilt at first, but both confessed their guilt after they were proved guilty, and yet they were discharged. Referring to the precedents cited by Justice Mitter, the Chief Justice remarks that the present case does not correspond to them. Now, this is what we do not understand. Whatever difference we have been able to perceive between the cases cited and the present case is entirely in favour of Surendra Babu. Justice Mitter was placed in an extremely trying position, but he has made us happy by evincing his habitual independence, fearlessness, and a noble courage. There cannot, of course, be any doubt as to the fact that it was only from a desire to uphold the dignity of the Court, and from a sense of duty, that the experienced Chief Justice and his other colleagues have passed the sentence of imprisonment on Surendra Nath. Nevertheless it would have been better if greater patience had been shown at this time of unhappy agitations. Considering the excitement which prevails among Anglo-Indians over Mr. Ilbert's Bill, the increasing dislike for Bengalis on the part of narrow-minded Europeans, and the pain which has been caused to European Barristers by the discontinuance of briefs to Mr. Branson not a few are found saying that the punishment would not have been so severe if the accused had been somebody else and not Surendra Nath.

NAVAVIDHAKAR,
May 5th, 1883.

17. The following is taken from another article in the same paper headed "A new difficulty for the Editors of and the liberty of the Press." —More than any others native

editors have been made uneasy by the imprisonment of Surendra Nath. Besides the reason for which the masses have been so stung to the quick there is an additional cause for the anxiety of native editors, namely that the severe sentence passed on Surendra Nath by the Judges of the High Court may tend to affect injuriously the liberty of the press. If the High Court continues to exercise the powers which it has exercised in the case of Surendra Nath, native editors will have henceforth to express themselves regarding the doings of the High Court Judges with the same fear with which, while the Press Act was in force, they found it necessary to comment on the doings of Governors and officers subordinate to them. Lord Ripon has extracted one javelin from our breast, but unfortunately the High Court is about to pierce our breast with another. We are seldom fortunate enough to be allowed to work under fixed rules. Laws are uncertain in their operation only when we are concerned. The jurisdiction of the High Court over us is something which is not easily ascertainable— which is uncertain and unlimited. This state of things is certainly deplorable. The High Court is the last hope of natives. It is therefore the duty of every well-wisher of the country to see that the justice administered by the High Court is pure. If the judgments of the Hon'ble Judges are in any respect defective, to point out the defect must be regarded as our paramount duty. But if the Judges transcended the

limits of the existing laws, and, seeking refuge under some indefinite and unsettled law, inflicted on native editors grave punishment for trivial faults, what wonder that feeble-minded and week-hearted Editors should have their minds distracted with fear, and that they should become disinclined to perform their duty? Fortunately there are not many native editors of this description. There are not many editors who shrink from writing what they believe to be true, or who through fear fail to point out what they conceive it to be their duty to point out.

We were formerly under the impression that, while native editors in the mofussil had occasionally to write with fear lest they should incur the displeasure of Magistrates, editors in Calcutta were free from any such fear. But now it is found that even in Calcutta native editors are not perfectly safe. After the degradation to which the High Court has subjected Surendra Nath, it behoves native editors to devise means of self-defence. There should be clear provisions made in law as to what would constitute a contempt of Court, and as to the language which the High Court would regard as contempt. The Judges of the High Court are not infallible, and their judgments are occasionally bad. It is the paramount duty of newspaper editors to refer to these cases; but considering that the expression "contempt of Court" is indefinite in its signification, the High Court might construe references made by an editor to any of its bad decisions as being a contempt of Court, and punish the editor. If a Judge were repeatedly found to give bad judgments through error or inadvertence, it would not be wrong to speak of him as incompetent; but seeing that the meaning of the expression "contempt of Court" is indefinite, the High Court might in such cases punish the writer. It therefore behoves the Legislature to determine what other meaning, besides that given in the Indian Penal Code, the expression "contempt of Court" will bear, and further to declare whether, in the case of outside contempt, the High Court has the power of inflicting summary punishment, and, if it has the power, to prescribe the amount of punishment which it shall award. We believe the High Court has no such power. There should, again, be clear provisions made regarding the nature of the apology which should be considered sufficient for the purposes of a pardon or a mitigation of the punishment; as also regarding the circumstances under which the full amount of punishment might be awarded. An apology in the case of an editor accused of contempt of Court should not be, as was observed by Sir Barnes Peacock, abject or humiliating to the writer, inasmuch as editors have constantly to depend on others for information, and are thus liable to error, and, further, as they write only for the good of the public. In these circumstances it is desirable that the law should clearly lay down that, if through the fault of a correspondent, or through his own error, an editor should publish an inaccurate version of any judgment or proceeding of a Judge, a public apology made by the writer should be held sufficient to exempt him from further punishment. The punishment in the case of wilful misrepresentation would be of course different.

18. We extract the following observations from an article in the *Som Prakash*, of the 7th May, headed

Mr. Ilbert's Bill.

"Mr. Branson's departure":—The object

SOM PRAKASH,
May 7th, 1883.

of Lord Ripon and his colleagues as regards the Native Jurisdiction Bill is indeed a noble one. They do not like to conceal their views and affect a lip-liberality. They endeavour to preserve the glory of England by doing great deeds. Wherein is the Bill introduced by Mr. Ilbert open to condemnation? Many say that, as India is a conquered country, the people of India should not be placed on the same footing with the conquerors. But it may be asked, who are the conquered? When did the

English vanquish India? If the truth were not disregarded, and past events were recalled to mind, it might be boldly said that the people of Bengal are neither a conquered people nor slaves of England, but that they are her friends. Extremely harassed by the oppression committed on them by a wicked ruler, the people of Bengal piteously sought the protection of England because they believed her to be a just, honest, and impartial power. If the person who seeks protection is, in the language of civilized men, called a "conquered person," then there is no help for it. What outspoken and honest person having the history of the battle of Plassey before him would have the courage to speak of Bengal as a country conquered by the English?

To refer now to the other provinces of India. The British nation had formed alliances and entered into treaties with all the native states. But the unquenchable fire of selfishness which was burning in its heart led it to be always on the look out for faults, till it picked quarrels with those states and gradually deprived them of all their wealth. If on the strength of these transactions one were to call India a conquered country, there would not be much harm so far as the people of India were concerned, but the stain that would thus be cast upon the holy British name would be such as nothing would be able to wash it away. In truth, no part of India was conquered by the English: their insincere friendship only deceived the people. The writer proceeds to remark that the Sepoy Mutiny was a movement which was confined to a small number of natives only, and for which the people of India cannot be held responsible, and that it behoves Government to extend the same treatment to the people of this country that the Scotch and the Irish experience at the hands of England.

SOM PRakash,
May 7th, 1883.

How the appointment of Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal should be made.

19. The same paper condemns the present system under which Lieutenant-Governors are appointed to Bengal, on the ground that most of the persons who have successively held the post of Lieutenant-Governors have been found to labour under strong prejudices. The reason of this is to be found in the fact that the appointment is reserved for civilians who are erroneously supposed to be well acquainted with the country. The fact, however, is that the Bengal civilians, from their contact with non-official Europeans in Bengal, come to entertain strong prejudices against natives, and a sympathy for the Europeans. It is thus that they are always found to harp upon the incompetency of natives, and to look down upon them. Of course there are honorable exceptions among them, but their number is very few. The present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is a civilian whose mind is full of prejudice. So far as appears from his acts, he is not believed to be a well-wisher of this country. By his approval of the Assam Coolies Act, and abuse of the Editor of the *Hindu Patriot* when that measure became law; by his inclusion of date-juice among exciseable articles; by his partiality for the out-still system, and by his opposition to the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill he has shown this to be the case. It is for this reason desirable that the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal should henceforth be appointed, like the Governors of Bombay and Madras, direct from England, and not from the ranks of civilians.

ANANDA BAZAR
PATRIKA,
May 7th, 1883.

Mr. Ilbert's Bill. Europeans hate
natives.

20. The *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, of the 7th May, contains an article headed "Europeans hate us as they would a mehter." The writer refers to the letter of a correspondent of the *Indian Daily News*, who, speaking of the proposed trial of a European by a native, asks what would the feeling of a Brahmin be if he were tried by a mehter? The Editor of the *Ananda Bazar* comments upon this question, and exhorts his countrymen, Her Majesty, and the Viceroy to bear in mind that Anglo-Indians look down upon the people of India as they would look down upon a mehter. The

Native Jurisdiction Bill, the writer proceeds to observe, has done one good : It has enabled the people to see that Government is not wholly on the side of the self-seeking and unscrupulous Anglo-Indians, and that it does not forget the helpless people of India, but thinks of them occasionally. Government does not, however, owing to these self-seeking Englishmen, succeed in doing anything for India. They have hitherto deceived Government by their professions of friendship for this country. Mr. Stephen, while he was binding the people of India with iron chains, and throwing thousands into prison, professed before Government to be a friend of India. Sir Louis Jackson claimed the same honour while he was giving wrong judgments in hundreds of cases. Viceroys of Lord Lytton's type put forth the same claim, even when they were sending India to her destruction. Now all such have been found out by the Native Jurisdiction Bill.

21. We extract the following observations from the same paper :—

Surendra Nath Banerjee's case.

The decision of the High Court in the case of Surendra Nath Banerjee is one which is

likely to prove injurious to the people of this country. By this decision the Judges of the High Court have interfered with the religion of the people, taken away the liberty of the newspaper press, and shown that there are not *men* in this country. The Judges have decided that the manner in which the *Salgram* was taken to the High Court was not open to objection, and that Surendra Nath had unjustly taken Justice Norris to task. Now that the High Court has decided that it is not wrong to take a *Salgram* to the Court, and that this does not constitute an interference with religion, there is no reason why judicial officers in the mofussil should any longer show any regard for Hindu idols. The people of India do not possess any political powers, except the little power conferred by the liberty of the press. But the imprisonment of Surendra Nath without any trial shows that the Judges have exercised a new power. They cannot punish a person accused of murder, or theft, or forgery without a trial. Even the assassin of Lord Mayo was punished after trial. But in punishing an editor of a newspaper no trial, it would seem, is necessary. It would simply do to arrest and punish him. In these circumstances publication of a newspaper in this country will in a manner become an impossibility.

22. The *Cháru Vártá*, of the 7th May, exhorts the people of India

Mr. Ilbert's Bill.

not to sleep over Mr. Ilbert's Bill in the hope that Government will do everything for

them. The battle is raging hot, both in India and England, and it is high time that the people shook off their apathy.

23. The same paper remarks that Mr. Rivers Thompson has disap-

Mr. Rivers Thompson.

pointed public expectations. His support of the excise policy of his predecessor, his

opposition to Mr. Ilbert's Bill, and his growing indifference to the cause of local self-government have combined to produce this result.

24. The *Samaya*, of the 7th May, disapproves of the decision arrived

Premchand Roychand studentship.

at by the authorities of the Calcutta University to make a visit to England compulsory on the

successful candidates in the science course at the Premchand Roychand studentship examination. The object aimed at by the Senate is a good one, but it can be achieved even without requiring the candidates to visit England.

25. The same paper remarks that Mr. Thompson has disappointed

The Lieutenant-Governor and Mr. Ilbert's Bill.

public expectations. He has identified himself with the clique of Anglo-Indians who hate natives. It is therefore no wonder that he

has opposed Mr. Ilbert's Bill, which is also sure to be opposed by the civilians as a class. They may oppose the measure, if they like, but let them not take upon themselves to say that the people of India do not want it.

ANANDA BAZAR
PATRIKA,
May 7th, 1883.

CHARU VÁRTA,
May 7th, 1883.

CHARU VÁRTA.

SAMAYA,
May 7th, 1883.

SAMAYA.

SAMAYA,
May 7th, 1883.

26. The same paper remarks that it has little to add to what was said by Mr. Justice Mitter in his judgment in the case of Surendra Nath Banerjee.

The writer would, however, observe: (1) that the Chief Justice ought to have allowed the question of jurisdiction to be argued; (2) that the sentence passed on Surendra Nath will not, as is expected, prevent native editors from doing their duty; (3) that the decision has caused the people great pain and sorrow; and (4) that Mr. Bonnerjee, the defendant's Counsel, has spoilt the case.

PRAJA BANDHU,
May 8th, 1883.

27. The *Prajá Bandhu*, of the 8th May, writing on the same subject, remarks that the people of India lament the imprisonment of Surendra Nath Banerjee.

They now fully realize the fact of their subjection. The sentence, however, will enhance, and not diminish, Surendra Nath's glory, and proportionately proclaim the disgrace of the High Court. The reference to Jeffreys and Scroggs might have been considered improper a few days ago, but now nobody will hesitate to associate the names of Sir Richard Garth and Justice Norris with those of Jeffreys and Scroggs.

JATIYA SUHRID,
May 8th, 1883.

28. The *Játiya Suhrid*, of the 8th May, does not agree with those who blame Lord Ripon for having stirred up the embers of race antagonism. The fact is

this feeling of jealousy was in existence, though in a concealed form. The natives were not happy, and will never be happy until the invidious distinction of race is abolished.

HINDU RANJIKÁ,
May 9th, 1883.

29. The *Hindu Ranjiká*, of the 9th May, expresses great sympathy with Baboo Surendra Nath Banerjee in his present misfortune, and expresses confidence in his ability and devotion to the interests of this country. The imprisonment of Surendra Nath will, it is hoped, bring about unity among the people of this country.

PRATINIDHI,
May 10th, 1883.

30. We have this week received the first four numbers of a new weekly Bengali paper, published in Calcutta, and entitled the *Pratinidhi* or *Representative*.

The number dated the 10th May thus addresses Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee in the opening paragraph:—" Go, Surendra Nath, go to prison. The dark prison will be to you a brilliant palace; the iron chains, chains of gold! To-day you have become the sovereign of the hearts of the people of India, the adored image of their hearts. The principle in which you have been initiated has become successful to-day; the vow which you have taken upon yourself is to-day crowned with visible results; and the tutelary deity you have worshipped appears to you and blesses you. Surendra Nath! from this day you have become imperishable."

PRATINIDHI.

31. The same paper continues:—A victim to conspiracy. Certain Englishmen for the sake of propriety and

Surendra Nath Banerjee's case. impartial administration of justice, and with a view to take away the liberty of the press, have, on a plea of contempt of Court, sentenced Surendra Nath to two months' imprisonment. Who will question the justice of this decision? Does he not know that this will subject him to the risk of imprisonment? Bengal mourns the fate of Surendra Nath. The Editor proceeds to make remarks similar to those noticed in paragraph 17.

UTKAL DIPÍKA,
April 28th, 1883.

32. The *Utkal Dipiká*, of the 28th April, makes the following observations:—" The post of head Moulvie of the

The study of Persian in the Raven-

shaw College.

six months. The second Moulvie does his duty very well, though he is said

to be incompetent to teach the higher classes. It is for this reason that the Mahomedan pupils in the second year's class find it difficult to go on with the Persian. We bring this to the notice of the higher authorities, and pray that proper steps be taken to remove the existing evil. The year is already far advanced, and if no teacher comes soon, there will be very bad consequences. After many years of indifference the Mahomedan pupils have roused and betaken themselves to higher studies. Now it will be extremely impolitic to throw obstacles in their way."

33. The *Utkal Darpan*, of the 22nd April, reviewing the events of the Public events of the last Uriya past Uriya year, congratulates itself and the public on the initiation by Government during that period of many useful reforms, such as the Local Self-Government Bill, extension of the jurisdiction of native Magistrates over European British subjects, &c.

34. The *Balasore Sambad Bahiká*, of the 26th April, feelingly notices the departure of Mr. H. S. Beadon, Magistrate of Balasore, and says that he was just and polite, and did a great deal to supply the wants of the inhabitants of Balasore.

UTKAL DARPAN,
April 22nd, 1883.

BALASORE SAMBAD
BAHIKA,
April 26th, 1883.

RAJKRISHNA MUKHOPADHYAYA, M.A. & B.L.,

Bengali Translator.

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,

The 12th May 1883.

CON

Mr. I
Opp
na
Price
Mr.
Bye-
Exa
The
Mr.
Sure
Mr.
Sure
Lord
Cont
Sure
Sure
Mr.
A C
The
pe
Sure
Sure
Sure
Exa
Sure
Sure
Sur
Nat
Sur
Mr.
Acc
Adr
The
I